

HEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY),
BINNIES FARM,
105, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS
23rd July, 1953

VOLUME 10. Part 8
Pp. 231—262

29.8.53.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions, Cases 17–25 : Cases relating to Articles 15,
16, 20, 21, 22, and 23 of the “ Règles ”

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1953

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence
(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 8 (pp. 231-262)

23rd July, 1953

CASE NO. 17

ARTICLE 15 : PROPOSED AMPLIFICATION OF THE PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)390)

DOCUMENT 17/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 209-212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 185-187), but, in view of its complexity, it does not lend itself to being summarised, and it is now reprinted in full. (Intl'd.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

PROPOSITION 8

Ajouter trois articles 15^{bis}, ter, quater, sur la façon de former les most spécifiques composés.

Article 15^{bis}.—*Les noms spécifiques, composés, formés de deux mots grecs ou de deux mots latins, deviennent généralement des adjectifs ; le deuxième terme, seul déclinable, s'accorde avec le nom générique. Ils peuvent être formés :*

(1) par la juxtaposition à un adjectif d'une préposition, d'un préfixe courant ou d'un adjectif numéral invariable (*subaequalis*, *pseudomonticola*, *unicornis*, *bimaculatus*, *triguttatus*, *decemnotatus*, *vigintipunctatus*).

Recommandation : L'adjectif numéral en composition avec un adjectif s'écrit en toutes lettres ; on ne doit pas écrire *10-notatus*, *13-guttatus*, *18-punctatus*. (Car beaucoup de personnes ne sauraient peut-être pas prononcer sur le moment *decemnotatus*, *tredecimguttatus* ou *duodevigintipunctatus*, ce qui est essentiel).

(2) par la juxtaposition de deux adjectifs, le premier étant réuni au deuxième par une voyelle de liaison *o* ou *i* (*fuscorufus*, *albogilvus*, *rubicoloratus*).

Recommandation : C'est l'oreille qui guide dans le choix de cette voyelle de liaison ; quand un mot supporte l'une ou l'autre (*albomaculata*, *albimaculata*), il vaut mieux mettre " *o* ".

(3) par juxtaposition d'un adjectif à un substantif réuni à lui par une voyelle de liaison : l'ensemble devient un mot adjectivé qui peut avoir :

- (a) une seule forme invariable pour les trois genres (*longipes*, *melanogaster*, et tous les mots composés avec *pes*, *frons*, *dens*, *thorax*, *ceps*, *gaster*, *color*, etc. . . .)
- (b) une forme déclinable de la première classe (*quadrimanus*, *a*, *um* ; *melanocephalus*, *a*, *um* ; et tous les mots composés avec *manus*, *carpus*, *tarsus*, *barbus*, *spinus*, *comus*, *stylus*, *ophthalmus*, etc. . . .)
- (c) une forme déclinable de la deuxième classe *flavipalpis*, *e* ; *tenuitarsis*, *e* ; et tous les mots composés avec *palpis*, *tarsis*, *barbis*, *rostris*, *cornis*, *ventris*, *collis*, *formis*, etc. . . .)

Recommandation : Quand un terme supporte d'être un adjectif de la 1ère ou de la 2ème classe (*longitarsus* ou *longitarsis* ; *flavipalpus* ou *flavopalpis* ; *rufibarbus* ou *rufobarbis*) il vaut mieux prendre la forme en *is*, *e*, qui a été la plus employée.

(4) par juxtaposition de deux substantifs :

- (a) le premier, complément de l'autre, se met au génitif ; de deuxième, considéré comme apposition, est au nominatif (*tauricornu*, *equisetum*, *menthaefolia*).
- (b) l'inversion peut ne pas exister, et, de ce fait, le mot composé a une terminaison au génitif (*densleonis*, *cornucopiae*, *cornupastoris*).
- (c) mais le deuxième nom peut prendre une forme adjectivale, et dans ce cas il s'accorde avec le nom générique (*vermiformis*, *e* ; *ferrequinus*, *a*, *um* ; etc. . . .)

(5) par juxtaposition d'un verbe et d'un substantif ; le substantif est devant le verbe, réuni à lui par une voyelle de liaison ; le verbe prend une forme adjectivale déclinable.

- (a) les verbes *genere*, *fugere*, *vorare*, *gradi*, *vagari* donnent des formes en *us*, *a*, *um* (*genus*, *a*, *um* ; *fugus*, *a*, *um* ; *vorus*, *gradus*, *vagus*) (Exemples: *montigenus*, *lucifugus*, *omnivorus*, *herbigradus*, *montivagus*).
- (b) les verbes *gerere* et *ferre* donnent des formes *ger*, *a*, *um* et *fer*, *a*, *um*, (Exemple : *crucifer*, *a*, *um* ; *dentiger*, *a*, *um* ;). Les formes *gerus* et *ferus* sont très incorrectes, et ne doivent pas être employées.

- (c) le verbe *colere* donne la forme invariable *cola* (*silvicola*, *agricola*, *monticola*, *floricola*, *ruricola*, etc. . .).—C'est donc une erreur que d'accorder ces termes avec le nom générique, on ne doit pas dire *silvicolus*, ni *agricolum*, etc. . . .
- (d) les verbes grecs *phoreo* (je porte) et *phileo* (j'aime) donnent des terminaisons latinisées en *phorus*, *a, um*, et *philus*, *a, um* (*stylophorus*, *a, um* ; *hydrophilus*, *a um*) Les formes en *phoreus* et *phileus* sont à rejeter.

Recommandation générale : Dans la formation de ces mots composés il est formellement interdit de former des mots hybrides en combinant un mot latin et un mot grec : *nigrocephalus*, *isopes* etc. . . ne sont pas admissibles. Cependant si certains de ces hybrides ont été formes et employés sans que personne n'ait jamais songé à les rectifier, il y a lieu de les conserver aujourd'hui en application de l'article 32.

Article 15^{ter}.—*Dans la composition de ces mots composés, l'hiatus doit toujours être évité.*

L'hiatus est très désagréable à l'oreille et les romains en avaient horreur ; il faut donc l'éviter autant qu'il est possible.—On supprime l'hiatus :

- (a) par la syncope de la voyelle finale du premier terme, ou de la voyelle de liaison ; mais on ne touche jamais à la première lettre du deuxième terme :

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| <i>pseudoagricola</i> | doit devenir | <i>pseudoagricola</i> |
| <i>quadriangulatus</i> | „ „ | <i>quadrangulatus</i> |
| <i>nigrolivacea</i> | „ „ | <i>nigrolivacea</i> |
| <i>Pseudoicius</i> | „ „ | <i>Pseudicius</i> |

(“ *Microorganisme* ” est un mot affreux que l'on doit remplacer par “ *microorganisme* ”.)

- (b) par l'introduction d'une lettre euphonique entre les deux voyelles de l'hiatus :

reemptus devient *redemptus* ; *reimitus* devient *redimitus*

(Le terme “ *prolandrie* ” pour “ *proandrie* ” est très bien formé).

Article 15^{quater}.—*Dans les mots composés avec une lettre qui rappelle un signe d'ornementation, il y a lieu d'indiquer, entre crochets, la prononciation de cette lettre grecque ou latine.*

[*lambda*]-*signata* ; *m[ém]-nigrum* ; *x[iks]-notatus*. Ici le trait d'union doit être maintenu.

DOCUMENT 17/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

**PROPOSAL NO. 8 OF PROF. BONNET (PROPOSAL TO ADD ARTICLES
15 BIS, 15 TER, 15 QUATER SPECIFYING THE MANNER OF FORMING
COMPOUND TRIVIAL NAMES)**

I agree with Art. 15 bis to 15 ter.

For Art. 15 quater ("in compound names, formed with a letter which recalls an ornamental sign, this pronunciation of that greek or latin letter must be put in brackets, for instance (*lambda*)-signata; *m(em)*-nigrum; *x(iks)*-notatus") I think it is much more simple to replace it by the following: "In trivial names compound with a letter which denotes an ornamental sign, this letter must be indicated exclusively by its latin or greek name, f. inst. *lambda*-signata, *mem*-nigrum, *iks*notatus."

CASE NO. 18

ARTICLE 16 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF A "RECOMMANDATION"
RELATING TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON
THE GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS AND HAVING THE TERMINATION
"-ENSIS"

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)391)

DOCUMENT 18/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 209—212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3: 197), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. (Int'l.d.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

PROPOSITION 15

Ajouter à l'article 16 une nouvelle recommandation sur la formation des adjectifs géographiques en "-ensis".

Article 16—Recommandation : *Pour former les adjectifs géographiques en "-ensis," au nom latinisé (ou non) des pays et des villes ajouter ce suffixe "-ensis" si le nom se termine par une consonne, et s'il se termine par une voyelle remplacer cette voyelle par "-ensis."* Exemples :

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Timor</i> | : <i>timorensis</i> | <i>Tirol</i> | : <i>tirolensis</i> |
| <i>Burdigala</i> | : <i>burdigalensis</i> | <i>Canada</i> | : <i>canadensis</i> |
| <i>Massilia</i> | : <i>massiliensis</i> | <i>Brasilia</i> | : <i>brasiliensis</i> |
| <i>Paraguay</i> | : <i>paraguayensis</i> | <i>Guadeloupe</i> | : <i>guadeloupensis</i> |

Explication : Cette recommandation est nécessaire, car de nombreux auteurs ne savent que faire en l'occurrence, et il importe par cette règle très simple de montrer que l'on ne doit pas dire *canadiensis*, ni *brasiliensis*. Finalement, la terminaison en "-iensis," n'existe que s'il y a déjà un "i" dans la terminaison du nom géographique.

DOCUMENT 18/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL N. 15 OF PROF. BONNET TO ADD TO ART. 16 A RECOMMENDATION UPON THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES FROM GEOGRAPHICAL ADJECTIVES ENDING IN *ENSIS*

I fully agree for reasons of grammar and uniformity.

CASE NO. 19

ARTICLE 16 : PROPOSED AMPLIFICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING
TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON GEOGRAPHICAL
TERMS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)536)

DOCUMENT 19/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Paper received on 14th August, 1951

Editorial Note : Prior to submission to the International Commission, the following paper had been published in 1950 (*Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse* 85(1/2) : 63-66).

.

La diversité de structure des noms spécifiques formés à partir de vocables géographiques est telle que je crois devoir l'aborder pour tâcher de déterminer les formes correctes.

Les Règles de Nomenclature disent dans leur article 16 : " Les noms géographiques conservent la forme substantive et sont mis au génitif ou bien sont transformés en adjectifs. Exemples : *sancti pauli*, *sanctae helenae*, *edwardiensis*, *diemensis*, *magellanicus*, *burdigalensis*, *vindobonensis*. " — D'autre part, à l'article 14 figurent aussi les exemples *antillarum* et *galliae* et l'on cite à l'article 15 : *janmayeni*.

Si l'énoncé de cette règle est parfait et si les premiers exemples sont corrects, je n'en dirai pas autant de *antillarum* et *janmayeni* ; ce sont certainement ces deux termes qui ont permis par la suite la formation de vocables tout à fait incorrects, comme nous allons le voir.

Quand il existe des noms géographiques latins, rien n'est aussi facile que d'employer ces substantifs, comme noms d'espèce, au génitif (*galliae*, *hispaniae*, *italiae*, *germaniae*, *lutecliae*, *romae*, *burdigalae*, *massilae*, *pyrenaei* ou *pyrenaeorum*, *athenarum*, etc. . . .) on encore des adjectifs dérivés, soit en *icus* (*gallicus*, *italicus*, *germanicus*, *pyrenaicus*), soit en *anus* ou *inus* (*tolosanus*, *lutetianus*, *algerinus*, *alpinus*), soit en *ensis* ou *iensis* (*burdigalensis*, *massiliensis*, *atheniensis*) ⁽¹⁾.

(1) Au sujet de ces adjectifs en *ensis*, *iensis*, j'ai déjà exprimé dans *Bibliographia Araneorum*, t. I, p. 132, la règle permettant d'employer l'une ou l'autre forme. Il me faut mentionner une exception fort ancienne, c'est *Athenae* qui a donné l'adjectif *atheniensis* (au lieu d'*athenensis*) à laquelle il faut joindre une exception actuelle, *madagascariensis* ; tout le monde utilisant ainsi ce vocable, il n'y a pas lieu de le transformer, suivant la règle, en *madagascarensis*.

Mais quelle règle suivre pour les noms géographiques modernes non latinisés ? Peut-on latiniser les noms géographiques actuels, en ajoutant, comme pour les noms de personne, la désinence du génitif latin *i*, *ae*, *arum* ? Les Règles de Nomenclature, sans l'avoir précisé, semblent le permettre, puisqu'elles donnent les exemples *antillarum* et *janmayeni*. On ne s'est pas fait faute de suivre ces deux exemples et de créer des termes comme *costaericae*, *cubae*, *panamae*, *mendozae*, *columbiae*, *portoricae*, *moraballi* (Moraballi, rivière de la Guyane), *missourrii*, *texasi*, *grandei* (Rio Grande, au Brésil), *transvaalis*, *pirini* (Pirin, en Bulgarie), *hebridisiarum*, etc. . . .

Bien qu'ayant une allure latine, ces termes incorrects ne me semblent pas admissibles. D'abord on n'en trouve pas nu seul de cette structure dans LINNÉ. Dans la 10^e Edition du *Systema Naturae* je n'ai rien trouvé de semblable; ainsi les termes géographiques se rapportant à l'Amérique y sont : *americanus*, *mexicanus*, *surinamensis*, *pensylvanicus*, *jamaicensis*, *carolinus* et *carolinensis*, *canadensis*, *philadelphica*, *brasiliensis*, par conséquent formés à l'image des adjectifs latins classiques et réguliers *gallicus*, *tolosanus*, *burdigalensis*, *alpinus*.

D'autre part si des termes comme *antillarum*, *hebridisiarum*, *janmayeni*, *panamae*, *cubae*, *costaericae*, *columbiae*, *portoricae* ⁽²⁾ paraissent acceptables, on ne voit pas cependant sur quelle règle on se base pour former de pareils vocables.

Car, si, comme pour les noms de personnes, on admet l'addition de *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* aux noms géographiques tels qu'ils s'écrivent dans leur pays, on obtient bien *janmayeni*, *moraballi*, *pirini*, *grandei*, mais alors il faudra dire : *antillasarum*, *panamae*, *cubae*, *costaricae*, *portoricoi*, *mexicoi*, *perui*, etc. . .

Ou bien, si l'on admet que, pour les termes finissant par une consonne on ajoute *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* et que ceux qui se terminent par une voyelle voient cette voyelle changée en *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* (après avoir décidé de quel genre seront les noms géographiques), on obtient bien encore des termes comme *janmayeni*, *timori*, *madagascari*, *pirini*, *panamae*, *cubae*, mais il faudra dire *mexici* (ou *mexiqui*), *portorici*, *grandi*, *peri* (pour le Pérou), *urugayi*, etc. . . .

Dans l'un et l'autre cas ces termes, qui ont d'ailleurs allure de noms de personnes (ce qui peut prêter à confusion) et certains une consonnance désagréable, montrent qu'il n'est pas possible d'établir une règle commode de latinisation des noms géographiques modernes.

Cela est d'autant plus à rejeter qu'il est facile de former, avec tous les termes géographiques, des adjectifs commodes, euphoniques, à consonnance latine très nette, à l'image de ceux créés par LINNÉ et indiqués plus haut.

(2) De toutes façons *costaericae*, *portoricae* et *columbiae* sont mal formés, c'est au moins *costaricae*, *portorici* et *colombiae* qu'il aurait fallu écrire.

Il suffit d'ajouter au radical de ces noms l'un des suffixes *icus* (*a*, *um*), *inus* (*a*, *um*), *anus* (*a*, *um*), *ensis* (*e*), en choisissant ceux qui sont le plus agréables à l'oreille, comme :

guatemalicus, *guatemalinus*, *guatemalensis* ;
costaricinus, *costaricanus*, *costaricensis* ;
panamicus, *panamanus*, *panamensis* ;
portoricinus, *portoricanus*, *portoricensis* ;
madagascarinus, *madagascariensis* ⁽¹⁾ ;
mexicanus, *cubanus*, *cubensis* ⁽³⁾, etc.

J'insiste sur le fait qu'on doit toujours prendre le terme géographique, tel qu'il s'écrit dans le pays, et non sa traduction dans une autre langue, ce qui pourrait donner des termes assez différents comme *equateurensis* au lieu d'*ecuadorensis*, *bresilianus* au lieu de *brasilianus*.

A ce propos, j'indiquerai aussi que, lorsque le nom géographique actuel a un correspondant latin, c'est ce dernier qu'il faut *uniquement* utiliser ; je m'élève contre la possibilité que laissent les Règles de Nomenclature (recommandation de l'article 16) de laisser subsister un *bordeausiacus* (pour *burdigalensis*) et un *viennensis* (pour *vindobonensis*). Je ne saurais mieux montrer l'absurdité de cette tolérance qu'en proposant des vocables comme *franceae*, *espagnicus* ou *toulousanus*. Si l'on n'admet pas—ce que je veux bien croire—*toulousanus*, *bordeausiacus*, n'est pas davantage admissible. D'ailleurs le maintien de semblables termes est en contradiction avec l'article 19 qui prévoit la correction d'un nom renfermant une faute de transcription, ce qui est le cas ici.

Quelques auteurs aussi ont récemment utilisé les noms géographiques avec le suffixe *cola* : *suedicola* ⁽⁴⁾, *canaricola*, *javacola*, *grandicola*, etc. . . . (qui habitent la Suède, les Canaries, Java, le Rio Grande). Cette façon de faire, qui paraît cependant assez régulière, ne doit pas être employée, car les Latins ne l'ont jamais utilisée ; le terme *cola* semble avoir été réservé pour indiquer les lieux habités : *agricola*, *silvicola*, *rupicola*, *humicola*, *monticola*, *floricola*, *graminicola*, etc. . . . Les termes de *suedicola*, *canaricola*, etc. . . . sont donc à rejeter ; d'ailleurs les formes adjectives suffisent pour la formation des noms géographiques.

La question la plus embarrassante est celle des noms géographiques portant le nom d'un saint, saint Jean, saint Paul, saint Pierre, saint Mathieu,

⁽³⁾ Il faut notamment rejeter *mexicicus* (*mexiquicus*) ou *mexicensis* (*mexiquensis*) qui sont peu euphoniques, ainsi que *cubicus* qui prête à confusion.

⁽⁴⁾ Ce terme est d'ailleurs un affreux hybride, puisque Suède se dit *Suecia* en latin ; c'est donc *suecicola* qu'il aurait fallu dire.

saint Vincent, saint Denis, saint Domingue, saint Thomas, saint Barthélemy, sainte Catherine, sainte Hélène, etc. . . ., ou un simple prénom (Maurice).

Ces termes ont des vocables différents suivant les langues :

| | | | | |
|----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Français | ... Saint Jean | Saint Vincent | Saint Mathieu | Sainte Catherine |
| Anglais | ... Saint John | Saint Vincent | Saint Matthew | Saint Catherine |
| Allemand | ... Sankt Johannes | Sankt Vincenz | Sankt Matthäus | Sankt Catharina |
| Italien | ... San Giovanni | San Vincenzo | San Mattio | Santa Caterina |
| Espagnol | ... San Juan | San Vicente | San Mateo | Santa Catalina |

Il n'est pas possible de se servir de ces termes pour former un nom géographique d'espèce, car chaque naturaliste risquerait d'utiliser le vocable que l'on emploie dans son pays ; d'où la nécessité d'avoir recours aux vocables latins correspondants : *Johannes* (is), *Paulus* (i), *Matthaeus* (i), *Vincentius* (i), *Dionysius* (i), *Dominicus* (i), *Thomas* (ae), *Bartholomaeus* (i), *Petrus* (i), *Catharina* (ae), *Helena* (ae), *Mauritius* (i).

A ce moment-là, rien n'est aussi simple que d'utiliser le génitif de ces mots, en faisant accorder l'adjectif *sanctus* (*sancti* ou *sanctae*, selon le cas) : *sanctae-catharinae*, *santaehelena*, *sanctipauli*, suivant les exemples donnés par les Règles de nomenclature (articles 15 et 16), mais en les écrivant en un seul mot, sans trait d'union. Les autres noms cités formeront les vocables : *sanctijohannis*, *sanctimatthaei* ⁽⁵⁾, *sanctivincenzii* ⁽⁵⁾, *sanctidionysii*, *sanctidominici*, *sanctithomae* ⁽⁵⁾, *sanctibartholomaei*, *sanctipetri*, *mauriti* ⁽⁵⁾.

Cependant pour certains termes il ne serait pas impossible d'admettre des adjectifs formés sur le terme original : San Mateo pourrait bien donner *sanmateensis*, San Juan *sanjuanensis*, San Salvador *sansalvadorinus*, San Thomas *santhomasinus*.

On pourra aussi dans certains cas apocoper la deuxième syllabe de *sancti* ou de *sanctae* pour former des adjectifs comme *sandionysicus* ou *sancathatinensis*.

Enfin *Mauritius* (l'île Maurice) peut aussi donner l'adjectif *mauritanus*.

De la même façon, pour des termes composés avec "nouveau, nouvelle, neu, new, etc. . . .", on formera l'adjectif avec le préfixe invariable *novo* (*novocaledonicus*, *novozelandicus*, *novosiberinus*), que l'on apocopera en *nov* quand le deuxième mot commence par une voyelle ou un h muet (*novenglandicus*, *novirlandinus*, *novorleanenis*, *novhebridianus*).

⁽⁵⁾ Et non *sanmateoi*, *sanctivicenti*, *sanctithomasi*, *mauritia*, comme certains auteurs ont écrit.

CASE NO. 20

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED DELETION FROM, OF REFERENCE TO
DIACRITIC MARKS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)744)

DOCUMENT 20/1

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

The problem presented by diacritic marks applicable, under Article 20, to scientific names based upon words which bear such marks was first brought to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in May 1951 by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (*British Museum (Natural History)*) in connection with the generic names *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896 (a name given in honour of the Swedish palaeontologist Leonard Törnquist) and *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann, 1930 (a name given in honour of the German palaeontologist A. J. H. Tornquist). Dr. Muir-Wood did not question the value of the provision in Article 20 that diacritic marks are to be preserved in the formation of zoological names; her sole purpose was to obtain a ruling whether names such as those cited above which differ from one another only by the presence, in the one case, and by the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over one of the letters are to be treated as homonyms of one another. Dr. Muir-Wood's application was published in September 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 92-94).

2. The publication of Dr. Muir-Wood's application elicited comments from the following sources :—

- (i) Dr. C. J. Stubbfield (London) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 114-115);
- (ii) Dr. K. H. Key (*Canberra*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 250) (see also a longer paper published in the present volume in the series of papers relating to the problem of the emendation of names, where it bears the number Document 5/26)
- (iii) Professor E. M. Hering (*Berlin*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 252-253)
- (iv) Professor Leif Størmer (*Oslo*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 253-254)
- (v) Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 254)

- (vi) Dr. Ernst Mayr (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 255)
- (vii) Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (see Document 20/2 annexed)
- (viii) Professor Rudolf Richter (*Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M.*) (This document being largely concerned with general emendation problems has been included under Case No. 5 (emendations) as Document 5/16)
- (ix) Dr. Gerhard Regnéll (*Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Lund*) (see Document 20/3 annexed)
- (x) Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A*) (see Document 20/4 annexed)
- (xi) Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) (see Document 20/5 annexed)

3. Of the authors of the foregoing comments eight dealt only with the question submitted by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (namely whether a condition of homonymy exists between two words which differ from one another in spelling only by the presence, in the one case, and the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over or under one of the letters of the word of which the name consists or on which it is based) or with the closely allied question of the method to be adopted in transcribing diacritic marks. Three authors only dealt with the broader question of whether it is desirable to retain in Article 20 the existing provision recognising diacritic marks.

4. Of the eight authors referred to above, seven take the view that the presence of a diacritic mark makes an otherwise similar word which lacks a diacritic mark an entirely distinct word and may be taken as being in favour of the retention of the existing provision in Article 20. These authors are : (1) Dr. Stubblefield ; (2) Professor Hering ; (3) Professor Leif Størmer ; (4) Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. ; (5) Dr. Ernst Mayr ; (6) Professor Richter ; (7) Dr. Regnéll. The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America took the view (by a majority of eight to three) that names of the class referred to above should be treated as homonyms of one another, but it did not suggest any amendment of Article 20.

5. The remaining three of the specialists cited in paragraph 2 above, namely Dr. Key, Professor Chester Bradley and Dr. Henning Lemche, addressed themselves not to the limited issue raised by Dr. Muir-Wood but to the general question whether it was desirable to maintain the existing provision in Article 20 that diacritic marks are to be retained in scientific names when the words from which those names were derived had letters bearing such marks.

6. The whole assemblage of papers received on the subject of diacritic marks is relevant to the consideration of the question raised in a direct form by Professor Chester Bradley (Document 20/4) and it is for this reason

that reference is made at this point to all these documents. An important proposal in a similar sense has been made by Professor Rudolf Richter in the paper included in the "Emendation" Series as Document 5/16. The only issue that arises at this stage is however the answer to be given to the proposal that the use of diacritic marks over letters comprised in scientific names should be abandoned, Article 20 being amended in this sense.

7. In the event of the rejection of the foregoing proposal, it will be necessary to consider the problem in relation to the Law of Homonymy raised by Dr. Muir-Wood and myself. For this purpose, this latter problem has been grouped with other problems relating to the Law of Homonymy where it appears as Case No. 51.

DOCUMENT 20/2

**By the JOINT COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR
PALEONTOLOGY IN AMERICA**

Letter dated 18th February, 1952

(Comment on the request for a ruling that two names differing from another only by the presence, in one case, and the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over or under one or more of the letters of which the word is composed should be treated as homonyms of one another.)

(Commission's Reference : Z.N.(S.)538)

The joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America has considered this subject, and I wish to inform you that, being polled, they voted :

To support the petition (8).

J. Marvin Weller.*
Bobb Schaeffer.
Katherine V. W. Palmer.
A. Myra Keen.
Siemon W. Muller.
John B. Reeside, Jr.
R. C. Moore.
Bryan Patterson.

To oppose the petition (3).

Don L. Frizzell.
John W. Wells.
G. Winston Sinclair.

I have a note in press explaining my own reasons for opposing this petition ϕ .

* See also a separate note by this author reproduced as Document 5/13.

ϕ The copy of the paper here referred to that was asked for has not yet been received. (intl'd)
F. H. 28th May, 1953.

DOCUMENT 20/3

By GERHARD REGNÉLL

(Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Lund)

Document received on 18th July, 1952

(**Editorial Note :** Prior to its submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the present paper had been published in June, 1952, in the serial publication *Senckenbergiana* 33 (1/3): 69–71).

Wiedergabe des skandinavischen ä durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet

Das Feld der zoologischen (und gewiss auch der botanischen) Nomenklatur ist voll tieferer oder flacherer Fallgruben, in die der sorglose Wanderer leicht geraten kann. Durch die Bestrebungen verschiedener Kräfte ist freilich manches geleistet worden, um den schmalen Weg, auf dem allein man wohlbehalten das Ziel erreicht, so gut wie möglich abzustecken. Freilich kann man sowohl über Weg als auch Ziel unbegrenzt und unfruchtbar streiten, aber allmählich muss doch eine Stabilisierung eintreten. Damit dieser Zustand nicht in allzuweiter Ferne winke, ist es wichtig, auch scheinbar bedeutungslose Einzelheiten zu berücksichtigen. Eine solche betrifft die Wiedergabe von Lettern, die gewissen Sprachen eigen und daher nicht international gängig und in manchen Druckereien nicht vorhanden sind. Dieser Fall ist kürzlich von RUD. RICHTER (1952) erörtert worden.

Lettern dieser Art sind in den skandinavischen Sprachen å, ä (im Dänischen und Norwegischen œ) und ö (im Dänischen und besonders im Norwegischen als ø geschrieben). Die beiden letztgenannten (ä, ö) finden sich auch im Deutschen. Sie können—und sollten—durch die *fakultativen Varianten* æ beziehungsweise œ ersetzt werden. Die Frage, wie man in dieser Hinsicht mit dem å zu verfahren hat, lässt RICHTER (1952: 361) offen: "Es muss den Schweden überlassen bleiben, wie sie das å durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet wiedergeben zu sehen wünschen, wenn eine Druckerei die 'diakritische' Letter nicht besitzt". Einer brieflichen Aufforderung Prof. RICHTER's entgegenkommend, will ich in den folgenden Zeilen diese Frage in aller Kürze besprechen und versuchen, eine Antwort darauf zu geben.

In den allermeisten Fällen handelt es sich um Autor-Namen, in denen ein å vorkommt, oder—was für die Nomenklatur von viel grösserer Bedeutung ist—um Paten-Namen, wo sich im Namen des Paten ein å findet. Dagegen dürften geographische Namen, die ein å enthalten, in der Regel nicht für nomenklatorische Zwecke in Anspruch genommen worden sein.

Zuerst ein Beispiel. Einer der hervorragendsten Schüler CARL v. LINNÉ's war PETTER FORSKÅL. Durch seine Reisen in Arabien machte er sich um die Naturwissenschaften hoch verdient. Ihm zu Ehren sind folgende zoologische Gattungs-Namen geschaffen worden (sämtlich NEAVE 1939 entnommen) :

Forskalia KOELLIKER 1953 (Coelent.),

Forskälia ADAMS 1854 (Moll.),

Forskaliopsis HAECKEL 1888 (Coelent.),

Forskalea IREDALE 1918 (Moll.),

Forskaliopsis COEN 1931 (Moll.) (Hononym).

Überdies bestehen folgende Synonyme von *Forskälia*:

Forskählia SMITH 1879,

Forscalia PAETEL 1888 (nach Artikel 34 und 35 der IRZN Homonym von *Forskalia* KOELLIKER).

Ferner ist auch eine Pflanzen-Gattung nach FORSSKÅL benannt, nämlich :

Forskaolea LINNÉ (Urtic.).

Abgesehen von anderen orthographischen Eigentümlichkeiten bemerken wir, dass das *å* auf vier verschiedene Weisen wiedergegeben ist : als *å*, und transkribiert als *a*, *ä* und *ao*. Welcher von dieser Schreibarten soll man aus orthographischen Gründen den Vorzug geben (der nomenklatorische Status der verschiedenen Namensformen ist hier ganz ausser Acht gelassen) ?

1. Von *ä*, als fakultativer Variante zu *ae*, kann offenbar keine Rede sein (eine Folge des Vikariierens von *ä* und *ae* ist übrigens, dass der Name *Forskälia*, der neben *Forskalia* nomenklatorisch gültig ist, auch—und empfehlungsweise —als *Forskaelia* geschrieben werden kann, wodurch die Attribuierung zu FORSKÅL völlig verwischt wird).

2. *ao* erscheint befremdend, obwohl in den Weltsprachen der Lautwert dieses Diphthongs an den des *ä* einigermaßen erinnern dürfte, und das *å* wohl dadurch entstanden ist, dass ein *o* über ein *a* geschrieben wurde.

3. Am häufigsten wird *å* durch *a* wiedergegeben. Weitere Beispiele (NEAVE 1940, 1950) : *Stalia* REUTER 1872 (Hemipt.) dem Entomologen CARL STÅL gewidmet (vgl. RICHTER 1948 : 130 ; 1952 : 364) ; *Westergardia* RAYMOND 1924 (Trilob.) dem Geologen und Paläontologen A. H. WESTERGÅRD gewidmet ; *Tragardhacarus* ZACHVATKIN 1945 (Arachn.) dem Entomologen IVAR TRÄGÅRDH gewidmet (in dem Namen *Tragardhacarus* sind also *ä* und *å* als gleichwertig behandelt). Zugunsten dieser Schreibart könnte vorgebracht werden, dass im Latienischen das schwedische *å* als *a* transkribiert wird : *Scania* steht für Skåne, *Acho* (oder *Achatius*) für Äke (Eigennamen). Doch ist es nicht

befriedigend, dass die Laute *a* und *å* beide mit der Letter *a* bezeichnet werden. Dazu kommt, dass dasselbe Zeichen oft auch für *ä* gelten muss (*Tragardhacarus*!)

Welche Möglichkeit bleibt uns dann übrig, nachdem wir alle drei obige Alternativen abgelehnt haben ?

Phonologisch hat das *å* mehrere Wurzeln, ist aber in erster Reihe aus langem *a*-Laut hervorgegangen. Dass dies der Fall ist, ist im Dänischen wie im Norwegischen besonders ersichtlich, wo das lange *å* durch *aa* bezeichnet wird. Doch ist die Letter *å* nunmehr im Dänischen und Norwegischen eingebürgert. Um eine Verwechslung mit einerseits *a* und andererseits *ä* zu vermeiden, scheint es mir angebracht, *aa* als fakultative Variante zu *å* anzuerkennen. Dass z. B. im Deutschen *aa* einen anderen Lautwert hat, dürfte in diesem Zusammenhang keine Ungelegenheiten verursachen.

Zusammenfassend ergibt sich, dass der von RICHTER (1952 : 362) vorgeschlagene Zusatz zu Artikel 20 der IRZN in folgender Weise zu ergänzen wäre :

“ Alle Namen, die mit *å*, *ä*, *ö* und *ü* veröffentlicht worden sind, dürfen auch mit *aa*, *ae*, *oe* und *ue* übernommen werden. Beide Schreibweisen sind fakultative, also nomenklatorisch unwirksame Varianten. Dagegen ist der Unterschied zwischen *a* und *å* (= *aa*), *a* und *ä* (= *ae*), *o* und *ö* (= *oe*), *u* und *ü* (= *ue*) nomenklatorisch wirksam und verhindert die Homonymie sonst gleicher Namen.”

Schriften.

- NEAVE, S. A., 1939 : *Nomenclator zoologicus*. 2. — London.
 — — —, 1940 : *Nomenclator zoologicus*. 4. — London.
 — — —, 1950 : *Nomenclator zoologicus*. 5. — London.
 RICHTER, RUD., 1948. Einführung in die Zoologische Nomenklatur durch Erläuterung der Internationalen Regeln. 2., umgearbeitete Auflage. — Frankfurt a. M.
 — — —, 1952 : Schulz der Tier-Namen vor Emendation. (Veränderung der Schreibweise infolge von Diakritischen Zeichen, Umlaut und Transskription). — Senckenbergiana. 32 : 357-366. Frankfurt a. M.

Zusatz der Schriftleitung

Es scheint sich nur um die Schreibweise eines Lautes zu handeln. Aber die bisherige Unklarheit darüber hat die Stabilität der Tier-Namen gefährdet und unnötige Veröffentlichungen veranlasst. Die dankenswerten Ausführungen des verdienten *schwedischen* Forschers werden endgültig Klarheit gebracht haben. Wir dürfen das um so mehr hoffen, als uns unabhängig inzwischen Kollege GUNNAR HEMMINGSMOEN von der Universität Oslo dieselbe Stellungnahme auch vom Standpunkt der *norwegischen* und der *dänischen* Sprache mitgeteilt hat.

DOCUMENT 20/4

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A*)

Statement received on 11th August, 1952

DIACRITIC MARKS

Article 20 of the *Règles* requires that in transcribing a barbarous word diacritic marks should be retained.

Diacritic marks form no part of the Latin language. A word written with a diacritic mark is neither Latin nor Latinised as Latin is traditionally written. Therefore this requirement is a direct contradiction of the basic requirement that the scientific names of animals must be words that are either Latin or Latinised. Is it desirable to make this exception to the basic rule?

In several languages, as for example Spanish, and the Scandinavian tongues, letters distinguished by certain diacritic marks are looked upon as representing additional letters of the alphabet unknown to the Latin language. They are no more Latin than is the Greek letter theta, which in transliteration to Latin would be written th.

The Standard Dictionary defines a diacritic mark as "A sign attached to a letter to indicate its exact phonetic use or value or to distinguish it from some other letter". Note that the phonetic significance of a particular sign may vary widely according to the language in which it appears, and that different signs may be employed in different languages (rarely even in the same language, as o or ö in Norwegian) to indicate the same phonetic value. In transliteration to another language, if retained, they lose all phonetic significance. Thus the phonetic value of diacritic marks on a word taken from a barbarous language loses all phonetic significance when placed over a Latin letter. It could only be used at all by a reader who knew the origin of the word and how that phonetic sign was used in that particular language. In even such an attempt to use it, the user would be de-Latinizing his pronunciation.

Certainly the rule including diacritic marks as part of the Latinised spelling of a barbarous word in *Zoological Nomenclature* contemplates employing only those marks that have become requisite to the proper spelling of the word in its original language.

All diacritic marks have a historical origin, and must be considered separately for each language. Many of these marks are the result of umlaut. Indeed the mark itself is referred to in German as an umlaut.

An umlaut is defined as the euphonic modification of a root vowel sound by the influence of a, u, or especially i, in the syllable which formerly followed. It is peculiar to Teutonic languages. In German umlauted vowels resulting from a, o, u followed by old i are written in either of two ways, namely ä, ö, ü, or ae, oe, ue.

Here it would be simple to require that such instances be transliterated into Latin by using the latter spelling (cf. Recommendation in Article 20).

Swedish, Danish and Norse each have three letters added to their alphabet which are for the most part indicated by diacritic marks, differing somewhat in the three. The writer is not a Scandinavian scholar, but these appear to be also the result of umlaut. They are :—

- | | | | |
|----|-------------|---------|---|
| 1. | Swedish : | Å | awe, pronounced as au in saw |
| | Danish : | Å or Aa | au, " " " " " |
| | Norwegian : | Aa or Å | awe, " " " " " |
| | | | in Norwegian this is identical with open " o ". |
| 2. | Swedish : | Ä | ey, pronounced as a in sale |
| | Danish : | Æ | Eh, " " " " " |
| | Norwegian : | Æ | a, " " " " am |
| 3. | Swedish : | Ö | eu, pronounced as Eu in French peu |
| | Danish : | ö or ø | Eu, " " " " " " |
| | Norwegian : | ø or ö | u, " " " " " " |

It would thus seem (but this should be confirmed by a competent authority) that character number 1 might be transliterated into Latin as " aa " ; character number 2 as " ae " , and character 3 (clearly equivalent to German ö or oe) as " oe " .

Turning to Spanish we note the letter enya written as ñ, n with a tilde. It forms the 17th letter of the Spanish alphabet and is a transformation from the ancient Spanish " nn " . I leave it to a Spanish linguist to decide whether it would be better transliterated into Latin as " nn " or by " ny " which seems to approach its phonetic value more succinctly.

The sedilla is used in certain instances in Spanish under c to indicate a soft pronunciation. In transliteration into Latin, perhaps it could be merely omitted, or there may be a better solution.

The use of the accent marks in Spanish may be either to denote a stressed syllable, or to distinguish one word or its use from another. It is doubtful that the framers of the *Règles* contemplated the retention of these, but if not, they should be excluded.

I have but the slightest familiarity with Portuguese and will merely point out that the diacritic marks occur in the following connections :—

Êi, Ói, Êu, ão, ãe, and ãe.

In French acute accent, occurring only over E, the grave accent over e, a or u, or the circumflex may occur over any vowel do not indicate stress. They have a historical background which must be considered in any decision concerning method of transliterating the letters that bear them into Latin, but this will not be discussed here.

In Hungarian the following diacritic marks are in obligatory use, each indicating a phonetic value of the vowel over which it stands :—

- á like a in father
- é „ a in face
- ö „ ea in earth (short)
- ő „ eu in French peu (long)
- ü „ French u (short)
- ű „ German fühlen (long).

Enough has been said to show the inadequacy of the statement “ including diacritic marks ” in Article 20, and to show that to include them is illogical.

If they are to be regarded at all, then a preliminary study must be undertaken in consultation with linguistic authorities, and an additional schedule appended to the *Règles* showing just how each diacritic mark (the use of which in the particular language is obligatory) is to be handled in transliterating each language in which it occurs into Latin.

Whether words already introduced into zoological nomenclature with diacritic marks (therefore not Latin in form and bearing marks that are meaningless from the viewpoint of the Latin language or as Latinised words) are to be corrected according to schedules of transliteration set up, to remain undisturbed, or to be spelled as they are with the diacritic marks omitted is a matter for discussion. That having been decided, the question of how these words enter into homonymy must be opened.

Since there are no diacritic marks in the Latin language, the conclusion is inescapable that a word written with a diacritic mark is a homonym of the same word written without it. It is debatable as to whether a barbarous word taken over into Latin as spelled in the original language, except with the diacritic mark omitted, or so spelled but with the mark is to be regarded as the homonym of the same word transliterated according to a certain schedule (ex. gr. mulleri, mülleri or muelleri). The logical answer seems to be “ yes ” but perhaps it is not a practical answer.

In any event the schedule suggested should be prepared as a guide for the future, whether obligatory or with the force of a Recommendation.

Believing myself that any author in coining a name from a barbarous word should be allowed the privilege of spelling it as he chooses, as long as he uses Latin letters, quite as though he were employing any arbitrary combination of letters, I should favour making a Recommendation for the future only.

From these considerations I propose that at Copenhagen in 1953 Article 20 be amended by striking out the words "including diacritic marks" and substituting for them "excluding diacritic marks", and further by adding words to the effect that the spelling of such a barbarous word bearing a diacritic mark may be interpreted to be that indicated by the historic significance of that particular mark in the language concerned particularly as shown in any schedule that may be prepared and appended to the *Règles* for the purpose.

DOCUMENT 20/5

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 6th September, 1952

Editorial Note : The following letter was written with special reference to a note by myself on a minor ambiguity in the meaning of the provision in Article 20 relating to diacritic marks, but it is included in the present series and not under Case No. 52 because in it Dr. Lemche raised the general question whether the use of diacritic marks should continue to be obligatory. (intl'd) F. H., 15th June, 1953.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)540)

The case Z.N.(S.)655 (*Munsteroceras*) is one of the many examples of the difficulties involved in any use of diacritic marks. It appears as if we are to decide either to discard any use whatsoever of diacritic marks and adhere strictly to the old Latin alphabet—or to use every such sign that may turn up in any language now or later written in Latin-like letters.

This last procedure is that accepted today, but the difficulties involved appear endless, and it may be better to postpone voting on Z.N.(S.)538 and 655 until after the general treatment of the problem. I would like to propose a thorough investigation into the consequences of the practical application for both alternatives.

Personally, I am convinced that the printing difficulties will always prevent any uniformity in the use of diacritic marks. Consequently, I am in favour of finding the best way to get rid of all of them—even including those in my own language. The old Latin alphabet contained no diacritic marks. These have been taken over from other languages, i.e. so to say from other alphabets. But no one has ever proposed to write—say—generic names based on Russian in the Cyrillic alphabet, but what is the difference between such letters and letters with diacritic marks introduced to indicate new sounds. People have simply used the Latin alphabet as a basic stock to which they have added freely extra marks to indicate totally new meanings of the letters chosen. I fail to see the necessity of accepting these marks when we discard cyrillic letters. The only thing we need is some advice how to transcribe.

CASE No. 21

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONCLUDING PORTION OF
" RECOMMANDATION "

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)392)

DOCUMENT 21/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 209-212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 198), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. In connection with this proposal, reference should be made also to a paper by J. Gerhard Regnéll, which has been included in the main series of papers relating to diacritic marks as Document 20/3. (int'l'd) F. H., 20th May, 1953.

PROPOSITION 16

Modification au dernier paragraphe de la Recommandation de l'article 20.

Article 20. Recommandation : Dernier paragraphe. *Pour les noms patronymiques comprenant des lettres ä, ö, ü, que l'on peut écrire aussi ae, oe, ue, il est recommandé, si l'on utilise ces noms pour former des noms de genre ou d'espece, d'adopter l'écriture ä, ö, ü, Exemples:*

*bäbleri (non baebleri)**Dönitzia (non Doenitzia)**Mülleria (non Muelleria)**brünnichi (non bruennichi)*

Explication: Il semble que l'usage le plus courant soit d'employer ces lettres avec le tréma. De plus si la prononciation *ä, ae* d'une part, *ö, oe* d'autre part, sont identiques, il n'en est pas de même de *ü* (que l'on doit prononcer comme un *u* français) et de *ue* que l'on risque de prononcer *ue*, ce qui modifie la prononciation réelle du nom.

Enfin l'écriture avec *ae, oe, ue* déplace sérieusement la position des termes ainsi orthographiés, dans des listes alphabétiques : si l'on ne prend pas soin de regarder ces listes aux deux graphies possibles, on risque parfois de croire qu'un nom est oublié, alors qu'il est inscrit à un autre endroit.

DOCUMENT 21/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

**PROPOSAL No. 16 OF PROF. BONNET, SUGGESTING A MODIFICATION
TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF ARTICLE 20**

I fully agree for reasons of uniformity.

CASE No. 22

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF A "RECOMMANDATION" DEPRECATING THE USE OF DIPHTHONGS IN THE PRINTING OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)258)

DOCUMENT 22/1

Letter dated 24th January, 1945, from **E. B. FORD**, M.A., D.Sc.
(*Oxford University, Department of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, Oxford*)

Following our conversation of yesterday, I am writing, officially as it were, to ask if there is any pronouncement or *Opinion* to the effect that the use of diphthongs is undesirable in the printing of generic and specific names. I think it very desirable that the use of diphthongs should be discouraged.

DOCUMENT 22/2

Extract from a letter dated 22nd January, 1945, from **FRANCIS HEMMING**,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to
Dr. E. B. Ford

The use of diphthongs in the printing of the scientific names of animals is, in my view, objectionable because such use leads very easily to misprints and even more easily to errors of transcription by later authors when copying a name from a book in which diphthongs have been used for this purpose.

There is, however, at present no express provision in regard to the question of diphthongs in the *Règles Internationales*, and the question has not been the subject of an *Opinion* by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 22/3

Letter dated 23rd April, 1951, from Dr. **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**
(*University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

I am in hearty agreement with the proposal that a *Recommandation* be added to the appropriate *Règles* to the effect that linked diphthongs æ and œ be not used in zoological names and that, where they have been used in generic and trivial names as originally proposed, they be replaced with separately printed letters "a + e" and "o + e". This probably requires some rewording of Article 20 which states that "the exact original spelling [of names], including diacritic marks, is to be retained".

CASE No. 23

ARTICLE 21 : PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF A DECISION TAKEN IN
1948 REGARDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH A NEW NAME IS
TO BE ATTRIBUTED TO AN AUTHOR OTHER THAN THAT BY WHOM
THE BOOK OR PAPER IN WHICH THE NEW NAME WAS PUBLISHED
IS WRITTEN

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)733)

DOCUMENT 23/1

By ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY

(University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.)

Letter dated 5th January, 1951

ARTICLE 21 : PROBLEMS IN CITATION OF AUTHORSHIP

At Paris there was considered the problem of citing authorship for names to be credited to other(s) than the author(s) of a paper or book in which said name first appeared (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 564-566). There was also considered the crediting of names published first as *nomina nuda* or given currency as MS. names (259-260). In my opinion a certain amount of conflict can arise in the manner in which these two rulings are applied.

Let us suppose that White publishes a new species L— m— and credits it to Black. I suppose that if he expressly states that Black has used L— m— as a MS. name, then the name L— m— is to be credited to White alone; but, if he does not so state, then the name must be rendered L— m— Black in White, —. But, suppose in the first case, in addition to stating that in Black's usage L— m— was a MS. name, White also indicates that Black was responsible for the description of the species. Which ruling then takes precedence?

I think some sort of clarification of this point is desirable to cover, if possible, cases that may be equivocal under the present wording of decisions taken at Paris on the matter of crediting and citing authorship.

DOCUMENT 23/2

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

In his letter of 5th January, 1951 (reproduced as Document 23/1) Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty has raised the question whether the decisions taken in Paris in 1948 in regard to the authorship to be attributed (1) to a name which, prior to being published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25, had acquired an irregular currency either through its having been used as a manuscript name or through its having been published as a *nomen nudum* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 259-260) and (2) to a name published in a paper by author "A" with a clear statement that the description provided for the name in question was provided by author "B" (1950, *ibid.* 4: 564-566).

2. For convenience of reference the two decisions referred to above are reproduced in the annexe to the present note.

3. On comparing these decisions it does appear that some clarification is required.

- (1) to make it clear that the special rule set out on pp. 565-566 takes precedence over the rule set out on pp. 259-260 ;
- (2) to make it clear that the special rule set out on pp. 565-566 applies only where the book or paper concerned contains a clear indication not only that the name in question was proposed by some author other than that by whom the book or paper concerned was written but also that the indication, definition or description on which, under Article 25, the availability of that name depends was written not by the author of the book or paper concerned but by the author to whom the name is there attributed.

4. In addition, it may be noted that, while the decision in point (b) on page 566 covers—as it was intended that it should—the case where an author "A" publishes a name with a clear statement that the description provided for it was written by another author "C", irrespective of whether, at the time of the publication of the name, author "C" was responsible for that name being published by author "A" or whether at that time author "C" was dead and author "A" merely published a manuscript description written by the deceased author "C", the wording used in the introductory portion of the foregoing decision (on page 565) is consistent only with the first of the foregoing situations (owing to the use of the phrase "published by one author in a book or paper written by another author").

5. Finally, it will, I think, be well to review the wording of the decision recorded on pages 259–260 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin* after the conclusion of the discussion which is to take place under Case No. 33 in regard to the status of names published in synonymies, in order to make sure that the two decisions are in line with one another in all respects.

Annexe 1 to Document 23/2

Text of the decision taken in 1948 in regard to the authorship of “ nomina nuda ” and manuscript names when first validly published with an “ indication ”

Extract from pp. 259–260 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted either in Article 25 or some other part of the *Règles* to make it clear that, when a name is validly published in conditions which satisfy the provisos to Article 25 and the name in question accordingly acquires rights under the Law of Priority and, prior to being so published, that name had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been a manuscript name, the name is to be attributed to the author by whom it was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the said provisos to Article 25 and not to the earlier author by whom it had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been given currency as a manuscript name.

Annexe 2 to Document 23/2

Text of a decision taken in 1948 regarding the authorship to be attributed to a name for which the indication, definition or description was written by one author in cases where that name and indication, definition or description was first published in a book or paper by another author

Extract from pp. 565–566 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to recommend that the following provisions should be added to Article 21 prescribing the method to be followed (i) in determining the authorship to be attributed to a name published in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors and to a name published by one author in a book or paper written by another author, and (ii) in citing names so published :—

- (a) Where in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors, it is clearly stated that one of those authors is exclusively responsible for the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named, the name or names so published are to be attributed solely to the author stated to be responsible for the descriptions thereof and not jointly to both or all of the joint authors of the book or paper. The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named by an author "B" in a paper written jointly by himself and one or more other authors (say, a paper written jointly by authors "A" and "B") is to be cited as having been published by "'B' in 'A' and 'B'".
- (b) Where in a book or paper written by one author (say author "A") it is clearly stated that the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named has been prepared exclusively by some other author (say, author "C"), the name or names in question are to be attributed to author "C", not to author "A". The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named is to be cited by later authors as having been published by "'C' in 'A'".

CASE No. 24

**ARTICLE 22: PROPOSED DRAFTING AMENDMENT OF, IN THE
INTERESTS OF CONSISTENCY**

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)745)

DOCUMENT 25/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The purpose of the present note is to suggest a small drafting amendment in Article 22 in order to remove an inconsistency between that Article and Article 23.

2. At the time when the present *Règles* were adopted, authors commonly placed the dates of specific names in round brackets (parentheses). The *Règles*, as then adopted, did not deal expressly with the question of the citation of the dates of scientific names, but a provision was inserted—Article 23—designed to make it possible at a glance to see whether a given specific name, as cited by a subsequent author, consisted of the same binominal combination as that which had been used when the species concerned was originally named. Under this provision the use of round brackets (parentheses) was reserved for distinguishing, either (a) the name of the author of a specific name, or (b) the name of that author, together with the date of publication of that name, in cases where the species in question was cited as belonging to some genus other than that in which it was originally described.

3. In the ensuing decades the need became increasingly felt for some convenient means by which to indicate whether the date assigned to a given specific name was the date clearly and correctly stated in the publication in which the name first appeared; for this purpose the practice grew up of placing round brackets (i.e., of fitting in parentheses) or of placing square brackets around dates assigned to specific names in cases where the date in question was determined otherwise than directly from the original publication. The utility of this practice was recognised in Paris in 1948 when rules were introduced for its regulation (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 225—226).

4. In the case of the names of taxonomic units, other than species, the *Règles*, as adopted in 1901, provided, in Article 22, that, where it was decided to cite the date of such a name, this might be done, either (i) by adding the date immediately after the name of the author, a comma being inserted between

the author's name and the date, or (ii) by citing the date in round brackets (parentheses) immediately after the name of the author, no comma being inserted after the author's name if this method of citation was adopted. In the period which has since elapsed the first of these methods of citation has become generally accepted, being the method used, for example, in such standard reference works as Sherborn's *Index Animalium* and Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus*. For this reason alone there would be good grounds for reasons of consistency for removing from Article 23 the second of the two alternative provisions. But, as it seems to me, the need for providing a means for indicating cases where the date assigned to a given generic name has been derived from some source other than the date given in the publication in which the name first appeared provides an overpowering reason in favour of the foregoing course. For, so long as it is permissible to place in round brackets (parentheses) the date of a generic name which is derived directly from the original work (*e.g.*, so long as it is permissible to cite in round brackets (parentheses) the date "1758" for a generic name or for a name of higher rank published in the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*), it will be impossible to apply to such names the system of notation adopted for specific names (see paragraph 3 above) for the purpose of distinguishing from one another (i) a date derived direct from the original publication (*e.g.*, the date 1758 for the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*) and (ii) a date derived from some source other than the book in which the name in question was first published.

5. For the foregoing reasons, I suggest for consideration (1) that the words "or by parentheses" should be deleted from the end of Article 22, and (2) that the second example given in that Article, namely "*Primates* Linné (1758)" should also be deleted, the word "Examples" being changed at the same time to the singular number (Example).

CASE No. 25

ARTICLE 23 : AUTHORSHIP OF A COMBINATION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)512)

DOCUMENT 25/1

By ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY

(University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.)

Letter dated 5th February, 1951

AUTHORSHIP OF A COMBINATION

Article 23 was only touched upon at Paris. The last sentence thereof was not considered at all; it is: "If it is desired to cite the author of a new combination, his name follows the parentheses . . ." The term "combination" is not defined or clarified. I have encountered two situations in which the authorship of a combination is in doubt and which do not seem to be covered by the present wording.

The first is the more general question as to whether, when a species is referred to another genus without the new combination of generic and trivial names being actually used, the author so doing is to be credited with the new combination, or the first author thereafter who actually makes the combination. In my own work I have made the latter assumption and an example is to be found in my paper on *Opinion* 99. In the case in question, Casagrandi & Barbagallo, in 1895, erected the new genus *Entamoeba* and referred to it the species *Amoeba coli* without making the combination *Entamoeba coli*, which was actually first done by Schaudinn in 1903. Therefore, under Article 23 should the complete designation of this species be *Entamoeba coli* (Grassi, 1879) C. & B., 1895, or *E. coli* (Grassi, 1879) Schaudinn, 1903? Some competent zoologists of my acquaintance would subscribe to the former usage. I personally feel that only a ruling of the Commission can decide the point.

The second point is in some ways comparable to the problem involved under Article 30 when a genus is established with a misidentified species as type. It is the case of a new combination based on a species misidentified as an earlier species. I have in mind the case where species, *Pelodera pellio*, was described by Schneider in 1866. Later, Bütschli, in 1873, described specimens, referring them to Schneider's species, which he transferred to the genus *Rhabditis*. However, Bütschli actually was not dealing with Schneider's

species, but rather with a species now correctly known as *Rhabditis maupasi* Seurat, 1919. *Rhabditis pello* is the currently used specific name for Schneider's species. Is Bütschli to be credited with the combination—or the first person to apply "*R. pello*" to Schneider's original species? I have, myself, taken the former stand on the supposition that nomenclatorial union of generic and trivial name is independent of the taxonomic application of the name. But there is room for argument, and Article 23 does not provide an answer.

Also, what about the case of a combination first used by a given author but credited by him to another? How should it be cited?

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Triple-Part 3/5 (Emendation of names)

Technical reproduction difficulties are still delaying the publication of Triple-Part 3/5 (dealing with the problem of the emendation of zoological names). It is hoped, however, that this Part will be published in the very near future.